

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/733,336 | 12/12/2003 | Abhay Sathe | 10030721-1 | 7472 | |
| AGILENT TE | 7590 09/18/2008 CHNOLOGIES , INC. | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| Legal Departm | ent, DL429 | DAO, THUY CHAN | | | |
| Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 7599 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| Loveland, CO | 80537-0599 | 2192 | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 09/18/2008 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/733,336 | SATHE, ABHAY | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Thuy Dao | 2192 | |

| | Thuy Dao | 2192 | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | ears on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 or CF4 1.131; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | n. | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the polition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for thin (b) above; if checket. A ray reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any sermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | | |
| They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally reje | | ne issues for | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | | |
| 7. \(\subseteq for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | I be entered and an ea | xplanation of | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a). | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | on of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. | ut does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other: | | | | | | | | |
| /Tuan Q. Dam/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192 | | | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

a) The limitations "libraries of software modules" (Remarks, page 8, third paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions.

The plain language of claims merely recites "a plurality of libraries of software modules maintained at a plurality of test locations, respectively, of a network" (e.g., claim 1, lines 2-3).

Sharon explicitly teaches a plurality of agents 14 deployed at a plurality of selected network computers (FIG. 1, col.5: 41-48, central management engine CME 12 as 1 apackage of software modules", FIG. 2, agents 14 include a plurality of libraries of software modules such as Network Monitor 32, Analyzer 33, Data Transfer Module 40, ..., col.6: 38 - col.7: 241.

b) The Applicant asserted,

"The GUI 28 taught by Sharon in FIGS. 7, 8A & 8B enables the display of a 'physical topology map 82' (FIG. 8A) and a traffic topology map 44' (FIG. 8B), although Sharon's col. 11, line 51 - col. 12, line 11, teaches that a user may navigate from one map to the other, or 'node hop' on the physical topology map to get information for particular network elements. Sharon is entirely silent on any ability to construct 'a graphical model of a coordinated multi-location test of [a network '("Remarks, page 8, last paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharon explicitly teaches "The received traffic information is preferably compared to the physical polocy and logical packet flow information do not correlate, and in particular if there are gaps in the logical packet flow information which should not occur according to the physical topology map, then LPC process 66 optionally and preferably sends test packets. Thus, the correlation of the traffic and physical topology might information by LPC process 66 enables changes to the physical topology map be to detected which would otherwise not be detected" (col.11: 6-15, i.e., using topology map 82 and traffic topology map 84 to monitor test packets between a plurality of network elements; or 12: 42-484.

c) The Applicant further asserted,

"Although the Examiner further refers applicant to Sharon's col. 3, lines 27-52, where Sharon indicates that the physical topology map may be used 'to guide the installation and deployment of agents throughout the network', Sharon does not indicate if or how this is done via the GUI shown in FIGS. 7, 8A & 8B" (Remarks, page 8, last 5 lines).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant felies (i.e., how to guide the installation and deployment via the GUI) are not recited in ejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 998 F. 2d. 1181, 28 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1957).

The examiner notes that the plain language of claims merely recites "a computer configured to) display a graphical end user interface (GUI) via which an end user constructs a graphical model of a coordinated multi-location test of the network." In the instant case, Sharon explicitly teaches "a CUI for displaying a broadcast node" in network (FIG. 7 and related text), "physical topology map" on diffraffic map ("FIG. 8A-8B and related text).

d) The limitations "the graphical model including flows respectively corresponding to the test locations, ... and ii) output the flows to at least one of the test locations" (e.g., claim 1, lines 6-7 and 8-9).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharon explicitly teaches "a physical topology map" (FIG. 8A) and "a traffic map" (FIG. 8B), which are equated with "the graphical model", wherein said map/graphical model displays/outputs/monitors test packets (flows) sent to network elements (co.1.16-61.5. co.1.2.4.24.8. co.1): 2.1-11).

In conclusion, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully maintains the 35 USC 102 rejection over claims 1-17 and 19-25.